

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes Cover Sheet

092333

Please find attached the Open Meeting Minutes from the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project of August 6, 2001.

If you have any comments or changes to these minutes, please reply to this email and your comments will be incorporated into the next meeting minutes.

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes

092333

Job No. 22192

Written Response Required: NO
Due Date: N/A
Actionee: N/A
Closes CCN: N/A
OU: GW/VZ100
TSD: N/A
ERA: N/A
Subject Code: 8830/4170

SUBJECT GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING - AUGUST 6, 2001

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Manager

DATE August 28, 2001

ATTENDEES

See Attached List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees
GW/VZ Distribution List
Document and Information Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:

Next Meeting: Monday, September 10, 2001 – 1-3 p.m.
Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)
Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411
Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Meeting was held on August 6, 2001, in Richland, Washington, in the Assembly Room at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Building.

PROJECT REPORT:

Schedule Update (Michael Graham)

We are wrapping up the draft of the Detailed Work Plan (DWP) for next year. The review for the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Project is August 29, 2001, in the Assembly Room. The U.S. Department of Energy - Headquarters (DOE-HQ) is coming out for the review. We incorporated the comments we received from the Five-year Review by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). We had an internal review with U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) last Thursday.

The Congressional Report is being delayed due to administrative problems. There are no issues with the report itself. The administrative problems should be resolved soon, and the report will be released.

The well decommissioning was completed last week. A concerted effort was made on the wells along the border, and that work is done. We are doing the final completion packages.

QUESTION: Does that bring you up to date?

ANSWER: There were 46 along the river to be decommissioned. There are still other wells out there that we need to look at. There are wells in the 200 Area that could be decommissioned.

QUESTION: Are characteristics measured after decommissioning?

ANSWER: No. After decommissioning, the wells are backfilled and considered to be done.

QUESTION: Are there standards in terms of what you have to do? Do you have an idea of hydrological characterization?

ANSWER: Every state has requirements of taking care of wells that were not needed any more. At Hanford, the real issue comes when a well exists that represents two aquifers. We look at those very closely, when there is cross contamination between aquifers. Low-potential risk wells are also a problem. We have put it off for years at Hanford, and state law requires it be done. This year we decided to do it.

National Academy of Sciences Briefing (Michael Graham)

Mark Freshley, Mike Thompson, and I went to Washington, D.C., for the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) debriefing to DOE on their study. The report was released last Friday, and copies are being printed now.

QUESTION: Mary, did you ever hear from Kevin Crowley?

ANSWER: I did not. And the report was not out on the web yet either.

If someone wants copies, we can do that. I tried to get Kevin Crowley to call in today, but he must be on vacation or travel. The NAS had a lot of good things to say. They gave us some ideas of where we might focus more attention. They felt vadose zone and inventory were well documented. We made an effort not to do more planning as we felt we needed to focus on prioritization. The System Assessment Capability (SAC) is one of those areas that needs more focus.

They also made some recommendations on documentation. One suggestion was to look at low-probability but high impact events in the SAC. There also were recommendations on Science & Technology (S&T) on getting a bigger bang for our buck. It was, over all, a positive report with a number of good recommendations for improvement.

QUESTION: Was it strictly science oriented?

ANSWER: Basically. There were just a few comments on management.

QUESTION: Is SAC development considered a technology area?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: How enthusiastic were they on developing SAC as opposed to clean-up technologies?

ANSWER: They were very supportive of SAC and the use of it.

They did think that a lot of the ecological issues were not suitable for funding, and that we should stay focused on Hanford problems, not national issues.

QUESTION: Are they making that recommendation to the greater body to support those issues?

ANSWER: They may make recommendations to Environmental Management – 1 (EM-1) and congressional representatives.

It was a lot of work, and they had a lot of questions. It is a stimulating group with whom to work, and they had useful recommendations. On the roadmap, we have linkages that feed the program. They kept asking for documentation of things we are not doing.

QUESTION: Who will be accountable for implementing their recommendations?

ANSWER: We'll be using it to develop future plans. Any NAS recommendations will be addressed in the roadmap this year. We'll develop internal responses to them.

There is a summary of the report that is about 5 – 6 pages. We can get copies of that for anyone who is interested. The complete report will be out on the website soon.

System Assessment Capability Communication Plan (Bob Bryce)

Edye Jenkins is helping to put together the plans to make sure we touch all the bases. It looks like by the end of August we will have the analyses completed. Our goal is to have a meeting with regulators the first part of September and meet with stakeholders later in September. We had hoped to be able to do a presentation at the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting in September. But, we are pushing that out to November.

200 Area Environmental Restoration Update (Bruce Ford)

About a year and a half ago, a Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) change package was completed that accelerated sites that received tank farm-related waste. We started in June on the characterization of three waste sites. The three sites are being sequenced to start work on the site that received the last contamination and work toward the most contaminated at this end of the effort. The first site, the 216-T-26, is in the 200 West Area adjacent to the TX Tank Farm. We have completed drilling the borehole that went through the crib to groundwater. At the T-26 borehole, groundwater was reached at 224 feet in depth. Contamination was contained within 60 feet of ground surface. The geophysical logging and decommissioning of this borehole has been completed. We are waiting for logging results.

QUESTION: Did you look at gamma emitting contamination?

ANSWER: Yes. We collected the full suite of samples identified in the Work Plan. The next waste site is the 216-B-38 trench. It's referred to as a specific retention crib. The tank farms team has a great deal of interest in characterization results at this site, especially as they fit with their conceptual model. As of this morning, we are down to 58 feet. Next we will downsize our casing. We are geophysically logging the upper casing today. The most interesting information about this site is that when we went in to it, we did not know where the head end of the trench was. We put in five drive casings equally spaced to try to understand where the highest contamination was. It was highest on the east side. We located our borehole at the farthest east location in the trench and collected geophysical logging data. We have collected all the samples identified in the Work Plan.

During the drilling of B-3B last week, we got into the over-burden, or the fill material. We got a hit of mercury five feet below the surface. We had identified that there was a potential for the presence of mercury. We continuously are monitoring for mercury during drilling operations. The field people responded according the Health and Safety Plan. It is interesting that the mercury was encountered above

the depth where the trench bottom should be. We will continue monitoring to understand changes in the mercury concentrations. Drilling at B-38 should be complete next week. At that point, we will move the drilling to 216-B-7A. That borehole will go to groundwater. We are specifically looking at alpha contamination of the B-7A site.

The momentum that Bruce has gained this year will continue next year. Both Tony's and Bruce's plans are focused on field gathering.

QUESTION: Are you going to expand remediation elsewhere?

ANSWER: We need to look in detail as to what might be in the trench. We understand it to be fill material right now. It was a surprise. However, it wasn't uncommon in the past, during a dumping operation, for somebody to do a super dump on top.

The field team responded admirably. We reconstructed the event the next night and recreated where people were at what time to make sure people were not exposed.

RPP Assessment Update (Tony Knepp)

We completed the field investigation for the S-SX Field Report. We are working on another for B-BX-BY. We are finished with the internal review and are about ready to submit it to the Office of River Protection (ORP). The report shows S&T and chemistry work and all the new inventory estimates. It demonstrates the amount of work done in the last three years at S-SX. We'll have a first class assessment on S-SX. It also addresses leaks from the tanks and what they mean. We are almost on a schedule to do one on B-BX-BY.

QUESTION: Is that at the outer boundary on the S-SX?

ANSWER: There are four points, at the edge of tank farm, the edge of 200 West, the edge of the Central Plateau, and the river itself. Two are land use types, and two are different risk techniques.

QUESTION: How do you measure risk?

ANSWER: Classical environmental risk. We look at what the effect of leaks is to the land use type and what can be done about it. As far as what has already leaked, there is not a great deal you can do about it because it's 150 feet down.

QUESTION: Did you look into the possibility of somebody building a house right next to the tank?

ANSWER: We've concluded that is not a wise idea.

We are doing other work in interim measures, trying to reduce the impact of leaks. We completed run on control measures in U farm. We are building berms around S-SX, T-TX, and TY. That will take about five weeks running about 12 trucks an hour. The berm around the 200 West Area is about four feet wide and one and a half feet high. We will finish this year's interim measures in about three weeks.

We've been working with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) and Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) on installing a moisture monitoring array in a well we abandoned in the B farm. We are measuring the water going through the farm. We also measure how fast the water is

moving. We finished that a week ago. We're finding that predictions are improved by making a better estimate of how much water is coming onto the farm. We will run the lysimeters for several years to gather the information. PNNL is also doing one at the S-SX.

COMMENT: The stated goal for this project was to keep a balance of monitoring, science, and field work to have a compliance driven project with a science link that allows us to establish a solid technology baseline.

Ecology Field Sampling (Dib Goswami)

Working with U.S. Department of Health (DOH) and PNNL, we are going to the field to take samples of the Columbia River. We are taking groundwater samples from the 300 Area to the Ridgeland water point. We also are doing biota sampling. We are trying to avoid any duplication. Details of the sampling will be done on August 27 and 28. We are working on the Sampling Plan with PNNL and DOH. We will take the Sampling Plan to Oregon and include any comments they have. The most important aspect is that this year the Columbia River is at the lowest point ever. We'll be seeing a lot of sediment samples and hope to get some good samples that are more representative of groundwater.

UPCOMING EVENTS (Michael Graham)

See attached Public Involvement Calendar

The INEEL Site Specific Roadmap review is going to take place August 20 and 21, 2001. I'm going over for that. The formal review of the DWP is August 28 and 29, 2001.

The next open meeting will be on September 10, 2001, due to the Labor Day holiday.

QUESTION: Regarding the Integration Project Expert Panel meeting, what has been their direction?

ANSWER: Their principle focus is on SAC results and the S-SX Field Investigation Report. They also want to keep a couple of open dialogue sessions.

NOTES:

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

If you have questions or comments, please contact Karen Strickland (509-372-9236) or Alison Kent (509-372-9192).

ATTACHMENTS:

1) GW/VZ Integration Project Six Month Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Martin Bensky – Tri-City Caucus
Bob Bryce – PNNL
Tom Cooper – WDOH
Bruce Ford – BHI
Dib Goswami – Ecology
Michael Graham – BHI
Mary Harmon – DOE-HQ (by phone)
Doug Hildebrand – DOE-RL
Kathy Huss – SAIC (by phone)
Edye Jenkins – ERC
Alison Kent – BHI
Charles Kilbury – HAB
Tony Knepp – CHI
Stuart Luttrell – PNNL
Doug Maddox – DOE-HQ (by phone)
Fred Mann – CHI
John Morse – DOE-RL
E. B. Nuckols – DOE-HQ (by phone)
Gordon Rogers – HAB
Sue Safford – Oregon Office of Energy (by phone)
John Silko – DOE-RL
Dan Simpson – HAB
Rod Skeen – CTUIR
Bill Thackaberry – FH
Mike Thompson – DOE-RL
Rob Yasek – ORP

GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT
AUGUST 6, 2001 – DECEMBER 12, 2001
FIVE MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR

August 6	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Edye Jenkins)
August 20-21	Review of INEEL Site-Specific Roadmap (Idaho Falls, Idaho)
August 28-29	DWP Formal Review
September 6-7	HAB (9:00 – 5:00 and 8:30 – 4:00, Seattle, WA)
September 10	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Edye Jenkins)
September 26-28	IPEP Meeting (BHI Assembly Room, Richland, WA)
October 1	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Edye Jenkins)
November 5	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Edye Jenkins)
November 13-15	Technical Information Exchange (TIE) Workshop (Albuquerque, NM)
December 12	HAB-PI